DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 384 570 SP 036 044

AUTHOR	Mead, James V.
TITLE	Labor Relations 101: An Undeclared Context Specific Course for Prospective Teachers in an Alternative Training Program. Issue Paper 95-1.
INSTITUTION	National Center for Research on Teacher Education, East Lansing, MI.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Educational Research and Improvement (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE	Feb 95
NOTE	25p.
AVAILABLE FROM	National Center for Research on Teacher Learning, 116 Erickson Hall, Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI 48824-1034 ($7.33).
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research/Technical (143)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Elementary Secondary Education; Employer Employee Relationship; Higher Education; Labor Problems; *Labor Relations; School Districts; Teacher Administrator Relationship; Teacher Alienation; Teacher Attitudes; *Teacher Burnout; Teacher Education; Teacher Education Programs; *Teacher Interns; *Teacher Militancy; *Teacher Morale; *Unions
IDENTIFIERS	*Alternative Teacher Education; Los Angeles Unified School District CA

ABSTRACT

This paper describes the effects of a labor dispute upon teacher trainees in the Los Angeles Unified School District (LAUSD) alternative training program. The individual stories highlight the stress a labor dispute places on those who do not have the status of full-time teachers or prospective teachers in a traditional teacher education program. In the dispute, the trainees had three logical paths to choose regarding possible actions they could take: actively support the union, actively oppose the union, or remain neutral. The trainees' post-dispute justifications for their choices and their views on professionalism are described, as well as how the trainees perceived the dispute affecting their progress in the program and their views of the Teacher Trainee program and the union during and after the dispute. Many people now argue that prospective teachers should have long-term and sustained exposure in schools if teacher education programs are to produce better teachers. The paper concludes that teacher preparation programs that demand sustained presence in schools for student teachers raise new issues regarding the student teachers' status as members of a school community. (ND)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

SP
NCRTL
price
$7.33

ED 384 570

Issue Paper 95-1

Labor Relations 101: An Undeclared Context Specific Course for Prospective Teachers in an Alternative Training Program

James V. Mead

National
Center for Research
on Teacher Learning

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)
☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Sponsored by the United States Department of Education
Office of Education Research and Improvement

SP036044

Issue Paper 95-1

Labor Relations 101: An Undeclared Context Specific Course for Prospective Teachers in an Alternative Training Program

James V. Mead

Published by

National Center for Research on Teacher Learning
116 Erickson Hall
Michigan State University
East Lansing, Michigan 48824-1034

February 1995

This work is sponsored in part by the National Center for Research on Teacher Learning, College of Education, Michigan State University. The National Center for Research on Teacher Learning is funded primarily by the Office of Educational Research and Improvement, United States Department of Education. The opinions expressed in this publication do not necessarily represent the position, policy, or endorsement of the Office or the Department.

© 1995 by the National Center for Research on Teacher Learning

NATIONAL CENTER FOR RESEARCH ON TEACHER LEARNING

The National Center for Research on Teacher Learning (NCRTL)[1] was founded at Michigan State University in 1985 with a grant from the Office of Educational Research and Improvement, United States Department of Education.

The NCRTL is committed to research that will contribute to the improvement of teacher education and teacher learning. To further its mission, the NCRTL publishes research reports, issue papers, technical series, conference proceedings, craft papers, and special reports on contemporary issues in teacher education. For more information about the NCRTL or to be placed on its mailing list, please write to the Publications Clerk, National Center for Research on Teacher Learning, 116 Erickson Hall, Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan 48824-1034.

Directors:	Robert E. Floden G. Williamson McDiarmid
Study Directors:	Linda Anderson, Deborah Ball, Daniel Chazan, Helen Featherstone, Sharon Feiman-Nemser, Mary Kennedy, G. W. McDiarmid, Barbara Neufeld, Kenneth Zeichner
Director of Dissemination:	Debra Peterson
Publications:	Tamara D. Hicks Syron
Office Manager:	Linda Quint

Many papers published by the NCRTL are based on the Teacher Education and Learning to Teach (TELT) study, a single, multisite longitudinal study. The researchers who have contributed to this study are listed below:

Marianne Amarel
Deborah Loewenberg Ball
Joyce Cain
Sandra Callis
Barbara Camilleri
Anne Chang
David K. Cohen
Ada Beth Cutler
Sharon Feiman-Nemser
Mary L. Gomez
Samgeun K. Kwon
Magdalene Lampert
Perry Lanier
Glenda Lappan
Sarah McCarthey
James Mead
Susan Melnick
Monica Mitchell
Harold Morgan
James Mosenthal
Gary Natriello
Barbara Neufeld
Lynn Paine
Michelle Parker
Richard Prawat
Pamela Schram
Trish Stoddart
M. Teresa Tatto
Sandra Wilcox
Suzanne Wilson
Lauren Young
Kenneth M. Zeichner
Karen K. Zumwalt

[1]Formerly known as the National Center for Research on Teacher Education (1985-1990), the Center was renamed in 1991.

Abstract

In this paper the author describes the effects of a labor dispute upon teacher trainees in the Los Angeles Unified School District (LAUSD) alternative training program. The individual stories highlight the stress a labor dispute places on those who do not have the status of full-time teachers or prospective teachers in a traditional teacher education program. In the dispute the trainees had three logical paths to choose regarding possible actions they could take. The author describes the post-dispute justifications and the trainees views on professionalism in addition to how the trainees perceived the dispute affecting their progress in the program. Following these descriptions are some speculations about what these trainees learned form the labor dispute. Finally, the author suggests what we might learn from this story. This is important because many people now argue that prospective teachers should have long-term and sustained exposure in schools if we are to produce better teachers. Teacher preparation programs that demand sustained presence in schools for student teachers raise new issues regarding their status as members of a school community.

Labor Relations 101: An Undeclared Context Specific Course for Prospective Teachers in an Alternative Training Program

James V. Mead

This is the story of teacher trainees in the Los Angeles Unified School District (LAUSD) alternative training program during a labor dispute. The individual stories highlight the stress a labor dispute places on prospective teachers who are not yet full-time teachers but also not the traditional transitory student teachers from a university teacher education program. In the dispute the trainees had three logical paths to choose regarding possible actions they could take. I describe the trainees' postdispute justifications, the trainees' views on professionalism, and how the trainees perceived the dispute affecting their progress in the program. After these descriptions I speculate on what these trainees learned from the labor dispute experience. Finally, I turn attention to what we might learn from this story. This final step is important because teacher educators claim that prospective teachers should have long-term and sustained exposure in schools if we are to produce better teachers. Teacher preparation programs, which require that trainees have a sustained presence in the schools, raise new issues about the trainee's status in that school community.

A student teacher's status in the school community is like a visitor. They are very temporary members of that school's community. The school community members tolerate these visitors and typically do not expect student teachers to be as committed to their school. In stark contrast, LAUSD trainees, induction program participants, and students in professional development schools are expected to be more committed to a particular school's community. Because of their unique, long-term relationship to a school, trainees become absorbed into the school community and form strong commitments to other community members. Other school community members expect trainees to assume all the rights and duties those in that community share. Those commitments can be to other teachers, administrators, or students in the classes the trainees teach. These new training relationships radically alter the way people in schools treat these novices.

A labor dispute represents a crisis in the community and this crisis makes demands on school community members. Trainees, as opposed to student teachers, are part of that particular school's community and therefore face those demands. However, if we search through teacher preparation program descriptions (including the Los Angeles program) we rarely find strikes and related labor actions as the subject matter for courses in ordinary teacher education programs. Usually, educational administration departments offer instruction in organized labor matters for educational managers. Alternatively, separate labor relations departments discuss labor issues with prospective union and management negotiators. A preservice teacher has little or no systematic study regarding teacher contracts, unionism, and disputes.

Even if a teacher education program did make labor disputes part of the curriculum, I assume this is very different from the experience of living through a school's labor dispute. These Los

James V. Mead is a policy analyst for the Chicago Panel for School Policy and Finance, 220 N. Michigan, Chicago, Illinois, 60601. His interests include professional ethics teaching using cases, justification in evaluation, and building qualitative databases.

Angeles trainees found themselves confronted by a significant professional dilemma in their schools. Any decision these trainees made had significant effects on the trainee's relationships in those schools. The Teacher Trainee Program gave no advice on this matter. Program administrators claimed the decision was for the individual trainees. The trainee's colleagues in the schools provided conflicting advice. Furthermore, the trainees themselves brought different views about what they felt were the appropriate decisions into this difficult situation.

The LAUSD Teacher Trainee Program deals with a "known context." Trainee, induction, or professional development programs use the context provided by a particular school and its district. This is not a "generic" teacher education program that has limited knowledge of or that exercises little control over where the student teachers eventually teach. This trainee program prepares its trainees specifically as teachers in the Los Angeles School District. The program's courses do not transfer for credit outside the school district. A course on cooperative learning or multicultural education has the subtitle—cooperative learning in the Los Angeles district. The trainees provide the evidence for the subtitles to the courses they take. Whatever the specific subject-matter, the trainees cited the trainee program's strength came from the shared context they experienced. When asked about the strength of the Teacher Trainee program most trainees talked about how they valued sharing the same problems and the same concerns within a similar context. Also, the trainees and the program instructors grounded their conversations within a shared context.

I provide no argument on whether traditional generic education or a context specific education is better. However, the new partnerships between school districts and universities raise new questions. I concentrate on those questions highlighted by this labor dispute. The Los Angeles story may help us to think about the unforeseen impacts these partnerships can have. The description illustrates the effect on novices permanently assigned in a large urban school system. These trainees had a learning experience, the labor dispute, that challenged ideas about their role as a teacher and as an aspiring professional.

One final note of introduction is that I accept, as the Los Angeles trainees data show, that the definition of professional is open to interpretation. Readers can put aside the professional literature where authors list differing attributes or characteristics for professionals. Trainees varied how they used the word professional. It was "professional" for various trainees to support and to oppose the strike. Individual trainees created different professional standards and different interpretations for their actions. The divergent interpretations are what make these stories interesting for those in teacher education charged with helping students make sense of the teaching profession.

A Chronology and the Background to the Los Angeles Labor Dispute

The Los Angeles labor dispute centered on two issues. First, there was a dispute over the percentage increase in the new contract. Second, and more controversial, were proposals to adopt site-based management in the district's schools. The second issue was controversial because there are states where contract negotiation law still excludes "educational or broad public policy" items from teacher contract negotiation (Bacharach & Shedd, 1989). Site-based management could lead contracted employees into decision making areas construed as "broad public policy." At the very least some school board members might instruct district administrators to resist teacher attempts to erode further a school board's diminishing control over local education. School boards are not alone in not wanting to relinquish control in schools. Legislatures in "progressive" states (e.g., New York, New Jersey, Michigan, and California) appear reluctant to vest control in site-based management. Lawmakers maintain legal tests and State Labor Relations Board oversight over teacher contract provisions. The teachers and the school board cannot redefine their relationship without regard to current statutes and policies that operate within a particular state.

The United Teachers of Los Angeles (UTLA) requested that members adopt a work-to-rule strategy in the 1988-89 school year after unsuccessful summer contract negotiations. There is broad variation among states concerning the legal structure in educational labor relations. In many

© 1995 by the National Center for Research on Teacher Learning

states strikes by teachers are illegal although they do occur at contract negotiation time. Blase (1989) found that there are states where collective bargaining for teachers is still legally prohibited. The governor of Michigan recently joined a long list of people who publicly discussed punishing striking teachers. To date, Michigan courts have restricted judgments to granting injunctions against local teacher associations. Michigan judges see unfair labor practices, highlighted in a dispute, as a reasonable justification for teachers to take strike action. In the California case the Los Angeles negotiations stalled and the union called for a strike. This strike lasted a short time at the school year's end. The union called the strike only after many months of work-to-rule.

A work-to-rule is a common labor strategy worldwide adopted by public service unions. Specifically, teacher unions can avoid any charge of illegality, which might arise, if the union declared a strike. Work-to-rule sends a message to management about the exact terms and the conditions that exist in the present contract. Work-to-rule is particularly effective in jobs where a full work stoppage may open the union to public criticism because its members provide a "vital" service. Hospital, prison, and education sectors for example maintain a minimal level of service that avoids public and legislative charges that the union membership endangered either life or some other public interest. When teachers withdraw goodwill it slows the education system that inevitably functions efficiently because the teachers assume extra duties and the teachers give extra noncontracted time. A further practical benefit to the work-to-rule strategy is that it makes employee replacements impossible. The employees report for work; therefore, it is difficult for management to justify worker replacement on the grounds the administration has to maintain essential services.

The recording and upkeep of academic records have been found by teachers around the world as a convenient noncontract duty to target for work-to-rule action. In the United Kingdom the two major national teacher unions (National Union of Teachers, National Association of Schoolmasters/Union of Women Teachers) have targeted grading duties to further union demands. The Los Angeles Teachers Association asked teachers to refuse to hand in the five weekly grades for students from the beginning of the new school year. This request put the novice teachers in the Los Angeles Teacher Trainee program in a difficult situation. These trainees, studied by the National Center for Research on Teacher Education (NCRTE), were starting their second and their final year of the training program. A decision by a trainee to comply with the union request had potentially serious implications for trainees beyond the financial costs suffered by any teacher who supported the union action.

The official Los Angeles Trainee program policy toward the dispute was a neutral one. Individual trainees had to decide if they should join the union's action according to program administrators. This neutrality by the program administration generated insecurity in some trainees contrary to the administration's espoused aim to allow trainees to exercise individual choice over whether to strike or not. As one trainee reported, "I've asked my union representative, and I'm afraid to ask anybody in the Teacher Training Program because I don't want . . . repercussions for even asking. I'm afraid." Trainees felt abandoned and they had many questions about their professional status. Until the dispute most trainees reported that they felt welcome and that they felt supported by the Los Angeles district represented by the Trainee program personnel. In baseline NCRTE interviews the trainees reported they identified with this urban district's struggle with teacher shortages and that the district valued the trainees' contributions.

This labor dispute caused many trainees to reassess those good feelings. The trainees reported significant myths that were current throughout the district. The first was that the district offered high pay to the substitute teachers. Trainees told NCRTE researchers that these replacements earned more per day than the trainees did. They resented that some substitutes were paid up to $500 a day by "substituting for" two or more teachers a day. The actual wage of $165 per day (in a Los Angeles Times advertisement) represented more than the average trainee's daily salary of $102 (allowing for 20 percent deductions from base). Cleo, a math teacher and a strike supporter, mentioned she did similar comparative calculations. I take it as significant that the trainees reported these high pay stories and that it is irrelevant whether the story was true. It showed trainees felt betrayed by the district, a district that they once felt valued its trainees.

The second widely told story concerned the Superintendent's chauffeur and the chauffeur's ninety thousand dollars annual salary. Many Los Angeles teachers used this myth to justify a claim for higher teacher salaries. Again, the myth's veracity is irrelevant. I "verified" the chauffeur story unprompted in conversation with a veteran LAUSD teacher I know and happened to talk to after the strike. Trainees who told this story linked the chauffeur's salary with the high salaries of ancillary staff in the schools (secretaries and janitors). The trainees resented the "me too" clause in the administrators' and ancillary school workers' contracts. Two trainees commented on how the teachers' actions and their sacrifices would result in administrator salary raises. These pay raises would inevitably follow from a "me too" clause in administration and ancillary contracts. These trainees resented in particular that the "me too" clause in an administrative contract meant a larger raise because many administrators received higher salaries in the first place than the teachers or trainees. For trainees, the high salaries for others signified the district's poor valuation of the trainees' professional contribution.

Trainees felt abandoned by the Teacher Trainee program. Furthermore, some trainees, whether they supported the union actions or not, felt the district did not value the trainees as professionals. Meanwhile the union, through its local representatives, offered mixed advice to trainees. Some building representatives told the trainees that the union could not shield the trainees from administrative punishment. One trainee observed the limited union protection was strange because trainees paid full membership fees to the union like any regular teacher. However, the limited union protection for Los Angeles trainees mirrors what Bridges (1986) reported in a study of incompetent teachers. Bridges found that nationally teachers with emergency credentials or probationary status before tenure received less union protection than full-tenure teachers. In California, emergency credential and probationary teachers had significantly higher rates of dismissal than full-tenure teachers.

The LAUSD trainees had probationary status according to the school district. School administrators freely acknowledged in the Bridges' study that it required greater effort and time to dismiss a full-tenure teacher. This meant the union found it easier to defend staff with full tenure. Obviously, ease of removal helps explain the higher number of nontenured teacher dismissals. As Bridges also found, the trainees justifiably feared dismissal from the district. Trainees could realistically fear that the district might withhold the evaluation that allowed trainees to claim a full teaching credential after two years in the program.

Trainees in the Los Angeles Teacher Training program had to complete two steps before getting a full teaching credential. The first step was that trainees teach 138 out of the 182 days in each school year. As the dispute changed from a work-to-rule to a strike, several trainees worried that if they joined the strike they might not complete the required 138 days. The second step to full certification for trainees was a favorable evaluation by a building administrator (trainees call this being "stulled").

The building administrator's evaluation was important. One trainee, who cooperated with administrators during the dispute, got what he thought was a "fair and honest" evaluation that listed good points and that suggested areas he needed to improve on. Never did the trainee report to NCRTL researchers that this administrator had doubts about the trainee's teaching competence. However, the LAUSD central office staff informed the trainee that the weaknesses the administrator reported jeopardized that trainee's chances for full certification. The building administrator, who wrote the evaluation, had no intention that the evaluation would be used against the trainee and offered to alter the evaluation in order that the trainee be fully credentialed.

Much more could be said about the procedure and the consequences of what amounts to a checklist evaluation (McLaughlin & Pfiefer, 1988). However, the point here is that other trainees heard this trainee's story at weekly meetings. Therefore, the trainees had good reason for thinking that any action by them supporting the union could result in a poor evaluation. Trainees who refused to hand in grades and who joined the strike exposed themselves to real or imagined administrative discipline. Those trainees could not count on strong union representation if they failed to complete each mandatory step.

© 1995 by the National Center for Research on Teacher Learning

During the NCRTE interviews several trainees mentioned the court decision pending about withholding student grades. According to the trainees the court would decide whether the school district could deduct some of a teacher's pay for failure to hand in grades. Trainees reported they lost salary over this issue. One trainee had salary deducted because she "lost the grade book." This trainee complied with the building administrator's request to hand in the grades and the grade book disappeared from the school office. The trainee suspected that a colleague removed the grade book. This incident, which represents other trainees' stories, showed how strong the antipathy and the ill-feeling ran among a faculty caught up in the dispute.

The Trainee Data

Twelve trainees supplied the data represented under the three categories generated. Table 1 breaks the informants into the different judgmental paths discussed in the conceptual framework.

A line across the three columns divides Mathematics from English teachers. All the teachers are in junior-high or in high school buildings. The trainees had backgrounds that influenced their actions or their reported reasoning during the strike. Some trainees came from a background that represented the written Teacher Trainee Program aim. Program administrators and legislators created the LAUSD Trainee Program to attract late entrants from other careers to teaching in the inner city. For example, Carson was an ex-engineer, and Carmen was a former educational consultant who gave school assembly presentations. Chad was a counselor from higher education. Clark was a former TV screen writer and a moving company owner. Catherine was a tutor in the prison system before joining the Teacher Trainee program. The program director pointed out that the trainee program did not compete with traditional teacher education programs because students from traditional programs rarely applied in enough numbers to teach in the LAUSD.

However, other trainees came straight from a baccalaureate program. These trainees saw the Teacher Training Program as a means to get paid and to get teacher certification. They joined the program instead of continuing through a university for an extra year in a teacher education program, as required by California law. This extra year required unpaid student teaching. Camille, Caroline, and Carol came from a postbaccalaureate background. Caroline, a postbaccalaureate trainee, reported that she would move out of Los Angeles when her spouse got a new job. This move out of the district coincided with her finishing the trainee program. Cecil was an undergraduate at a local university who responded to a campus advertisement to join the Trainee program. Cain was a mathematics major undergraduate who saw the trainee program as a way to get paid and to become qualified as a teacher. Chase was a liberal arts graduate who in his words, "got tired of sitting in school." These

Table 1
Trainees Grouped According to Their Actions During the Los Angeles Labor Dispute

	Active Union Supporters	Neutral Position	Actively Opposed to Union
Math Teachers	Cain Carson Cleo	Cecil	Camille Carol Catherine
English Teachers	Clark	Caroline Carmen Chase	Chad

postbaccalaureate trainees made an opportunistic decision to enter the Trainee program and to be paid as they worked to attain a full teaching credential. These opportunists in the LAUSD Teacher Trainee program were not anticipated by the California legislators.

How NCRTE Researchers Gathered the Data

The data come from the protocol developed by the investigating team and by the additional material trainees supplied incidentally during other interviews. I discuss the three judgmental paths represented by the columns in Table 1 under three topics:

1. How did the trainee think the strike affected the trainee's progress through the program?
2. Why did the trainee decide or not decide to strike?
3. How has the strike affected the trainees' views of teaching as a profession?

The Conceptual Framework for Analysis

I used the analysis process described in Alisdair MacIntyre's (1988) book, *Whose Justice? Which Rationality?* MacIntyre wrote that there was a logical structure for a practical syllogism. The syllogism, or form of reasoning, in question is that from two premises that have a common term it is possible to deduce a conclusion.[2] Here the trainees formed two premises from which they deduced that their actions furthered their sense of professional duty. In their first premise the trainees affirmed for NCRTE interviewers that the action they took during the dispute furthered that trainees' sense of professionalism (the "good" being considered here). For the second premise trainees described the labor dispute as an appropriate occasion for the action generated by the first premise. Trainees deduced three "right" decisions from the two premises. Some trainees deduced that their professional duties included actively supporting the union's actions by boycotting grades and striking. Other trainees deduced that they should remain neutral in the dispute. The last group of trainees deduced that they actively opposed the strike and they rejected what the union was asking teachers to do.

How can these twelve trainees make three incompatible decisions and claim they are right? Aristotle and MacIntyre claim that individual judgment cannot be rational unless viewed within the context of Aristotle's collective (polis). As I read the data, I realized that the individual trainees described different communities to which they felt they belonged and to which they owed certain professional duties and responsibilities. Trainees offered varied accounts about the "right" decision because they described different communities to which they felt accountable. In the interviews the trainees tried to make their decision make sense in relation to the particular community with which they identified. That community defined for that trainee what it meant to be a teaching professional. Trainees described various communities such as the UTLA teachers, the LAUSD Teacher Trainee Program, the classroom community, and an ideal community of professional teachers.

Question 1: The Dispute and Its Effect on a Trainee's Progress in the Program

The Active Union Supporters: Cain, Carson, Cleo, and Clark

Cain, Carson, and Clark talked confidently about how their actions during the dispute would not affect their progress through the Teacher Trainee Program. Each trainee justified the decision to support the union in different ways. First, Carson claimed "I'm done with the program. The only thing required of me is to go downtown sometime during the summer and to fill out some papers." Second, Clark expected to teach in a community college the following year; consequently, Clark felt a secondary teaching certificate was less important. Last, Cain and Carson shared the feeling that they had met all the Trainee Program requirements. Furthermore, Cain relied on the argument that the district administration invited trouble if they singled out individual teachers for punishment. He believed that collective action by teachers would go unpunished.

© 1995 by the National Center for Research on Teacher Learning

I: Do you think there are ways in which the strike may affect your progress through the program?

Cain: I don't think so at this point. I hope not, from what I understand, we have met the different things. The number of days taught and we have been "stulled" [administrator evaluation]. I should get my credential. I don't think that the strike affects my chances to get rehired. There are many teachers out on strike and I don't think the district would not rehire them.

Cleo was not so confident about predicting the outcome of her actions. She lessened this anxiety by dividing her responsibilities into two distinct roles. As a teacher employed by the district, she felt a collegial responsibility to support the strike. She withheld her grades and she struck with other teachers. As a "student" (a trainee awaiting certification) she complied with the program's requirement and she attended a mandatory graduation ceremony. There was confusion among the trainees concerning whether the trainee program required people to attend this graduation ceremony. Cleo claimed the union building representatives sanctioned her decisions.

Cleo: I've wondered if I'll still get my credential because I walked off the job. . . . I work for LAUSD and I am an employee but I am also a student. I don't know what the Trainee administrators think I am but I consider myself a student getting a credential or some kind of degree. Just like I was going to a university and I was getting a degree that I paid them for.

All four trainees supported and participated in the strike. They saw themselves in their new role as full members in the teaching profession. Even Cleo, despite being concerned she might not get the credential, felt she had a duty to support fellow teachers. Cain, Carson, and Clark felt they had completed the trainee role, and therefore, they did not feel any obligation to the Teacher Trainee Program. Cain and Carson wanted to adopt their new role as teachers. Clark did not know if he would benefit personally from the union's action in the coming year, but he did not consider himself a trainee any longer. All four trainees identified the UTLA teaching community as the group to whom they felt responsible as new members.

The Neutral Position:
Cecil, Carmen, Caroline, and Chase

Cecil left the Trainee Program after a semester and so he was not subject to the same constraints as the trainees. He was teaching under the emergency credential program. As a former trainee who entered a part-time training program at a local college, he saw the strike in the same way that a student in traditional teacher training programs would see it. Cecil thought the teachers' strike was not a college student's concern.

Carmen explained that she could not join the strike because, "I won't have enough days to complete my credential." She told the NCRTE interviewer that the administration treated her like a student "for being tardy" after she admitted being late 32 times during the school year. She hoped the strike would be short. While it lasted, she told the NCRTE interviewer that she "called in sick" or she "just stayed at home" to avoid confrontations with colleagues. Carmen hoped that by staying home she could maintain relationships with colleagues who supported the strike.

Caroline and Chase claimed the building representative supported their action to remain neutral during the strike. Both trainees felt they must remain neutral otherwise their progress in the trainee program would be affected. Chase described the trainees' position as "trying to please both sides, the Teacher Trainee Program and the union." These three trainees who remained neutral during the dispute described themselves as still having responsibilities to the Teacher Trainee community. Admittedly, Carmen's allegiance to that community could be attributed to her constant lateness.

The Active Union Opposition:
Camille, Catherine, Carol, and Chad

Camille described her perception that she was in a "tenuous position" in the Trainee Program. She worried that other districts might not recognize twenty-one program units in her teaching certificate if she moved to another district. Camille reported that she considered moving out of the district for the next school year.

I am not really sure if I want to stay in the district. I feel great about whom I work with and I love my school. But, I feel uncomfortable with the way the district treats you like a number. The strike made

> me think that I was not important as a teacher just a number. I am taking classes through a college that will transfer to other districts and I avoid the [LAUSD] courses that are not transferable.

Camille said that a union representative supported her decision. However, she claimed sympathy with the union position because of the way the district treated its teachers. Camille makes a good contrast with those trainees who supported the union. She, unlike strike supporters such as Cain, did not see herself as a teacher but as a trainee. Because Camille did not see herself as "finished with the program" she did not adopt the new role of a "Los Angeles teacher" and thus remained a "Los Angeles trainee."

Carol cited the overriding importance for her that she fulfill the trainee program's requirements. The strikers' decision not to fulfill the teaching duties was "scary" to her. Those trainees who supported the union took a big risk by choosing not to perform the district required teaching duties. If "you didn't complete your duties as a teacher . . . you'll have to go through another year to complete your credential." Carol justified her decision to continue to work normally because she vaguely recalled a member of the Trainee Program personnel supported her decision. Furthermore, Carol admitted that a personal consideration figured in her decision. Carol mentioned that her impending departure to graduate school would strain her finances. She worried that if she joined the dispute she might lose salary, and this loss in income would affect her ability to save for graduate school.

Chad and Catherine are the two informants who do not talk about progress through the program as a criterion for their decision not to strike. They decided to strongly oppose the strike and did not support the work-to-rule. This decision came from their opposition to teacher unions and a hostility to all the union stood for.

Question 2: Looking at Trainees' Decision to Strike or Not

The Active Union Supporters: Cain, Carson, Cleo, and Clark

Carson claimed that all "good teachers" in his school supported the strike. "We're all pro . . . (the) strike." He was "very proud to see teachers stand-up and saying we deserve better. Carson also judged that those teachers not sympathetic to the strike were "absolutely the worst teachers in the school." Carson made a sweeping condemnation about the professional competence of those teachers who failed to support the union. This matched an equal condemnation by trainees opposed to the strike about the striker's professional competence. Both groups of trainees felt the need to justify their position by undermining their opponents. This strategy results in making your community appear professional compared with others. Strike supporters also directed their attacks against communities such as administrators.

Carson explained his decision to strike so that "administrators realize my needs to have some input into how that school is run." Carson explicitly linked a higher salary to the site-based management issue. He felt the public equated "poor pay" as a sign that teachers did not deserve society's respect as professionals. Speaking as an ex-engineer, Carson rejected the engineering school professionalism model where he had been told striking was unprofessional. At engineering school he received "the standard line" that professionals collected fees. Carson saw this professional definition as incompatible with engineers, teachers, and other professionals who worked in large organizations.

As a professional teacher he worried that students might suffer because of his actions. Therefore, he adjusted his work plan before the strike so that he covered the "important stuff."

> I am concerned that the strike is settled soon. I had barely enough time in my Algebra One classes to finish the quadratic equation topic. With a few weeks left in the term I worry that we will not get to the derivation of quadratic equations. They will need that in Algebra Two. It is very important because it is a stepping stone, a major theme used in Algebra Two.

Carson thought that administrators were autocratic and that administrators should have their power curbed by giving teachers and parents more say in how the schools are run. He offered a story in support of this opinion. A building administrator had forbidden him to repair the teacher's photocopy machine. Carson described the repair as obvious, and offered to repair it. The administrator knew that Carson was an ex-engineer, but still the administrator forbade him to

© 1995 by the National Center for Research on Teacher Learning

touch it. Furthermore, Carson felt that as a teacher the administration discounted his and other teachers' professional status. In his school the administration used a heavy-duty copier very lightly, yet the teachers had a light-use model that frequently failed because of its heavy use. When he asked why the teachers could not use the heavy-duty copier, an administrator said that the teachers might damage the administration's copier. Carson saw this as one example where the administration lacked trust in the teachers' professionalism. Administrators preferred to make all the decisions whatever others' opinions.

Clark, like Carson, felt that the students and the administrators lacked respect for teachers. He reported students frequently told him that "teachers are viewed as people who have failed somehow." A professional teacher community for Clark centered on him acting as a role model through his professional actions. In contrast, administrators were "company men." Clark felt that as servants of the district it did not surprise Clark to see administrators act the way they did during the dispute. For Clark, administrators "don't have much to do with the educative process." Administrators are "poor business managers at best."

Cain summed up his position with a touch of pragmatism concerning his involvement. He said:

> I agree with the union when they say the teachers need more money and I think. . . . The teachers need to have more say in the running of the schools. [I prefer] not to hassle crossing the picket lines. I'll stay out one week . . . I've set myself limits . . . after that I don't know.

Cain claimed "nobody got strongly emotional over individual decisions to take part in the dispute." Therefore Cain denied what trainees who opposed the strike and the work-to-rule decision reported. Cain felt that the union supporters applied little pressure to their noncompliant colleagues. He mentioned his mentor teacher who was close to retirement and who stood to gain little from the dispute. Cain claimed that his mentor would suffer a financial loss because he retired at the end of the current year. Again we can see pragmatic appeal in Cain's judgment. However, this tolerance by Cain is strictly for that particular teacher and it did not extend to others in school.

Cain was less tolerant with administrators and counselors in school. Their actions justified the union's position that teachers should have more say running the school. "It seems that the further people in the school district get away from the kids, the more money they get paid." He complained that despite the extra money, administrators failed to provide leadership. Cain thought that administrators and counselors gave the false impression of "knowing how things run but they really don't." He contrasted this administrator's facade with teachers who had daily student contact. Teachers, who Cain thought really did know how things worked in schools, were discounted in his building as a source of worthwhile input into administrative decisions.

Cleo claimed she supported the union's demand for school based management as much as the salary increase. Cleo shared Cain's assessment that teachers had little influence in managing the schools. She justified her decision to join the picket line because teachers lacked professional status. School districts demand teachers take extra years of education. These demands for extra education do not translate for teachers, as they do in other professions, into deserved professional status and recognition.

> We are not treated as professionals as far as salary range and decision making input. We are required to have extra schooling and credentials, to be experts in what we teach but we are not treated as professionals. When you talk about doctors as professionals, they are a group that regulates themselves. They have a system of education and a credential. As professionals they set high standards for themselves and I just don't see these things happening with teachers.

Cleo thought that teachers were not treated as professionals, feeling instead "like a factory worker on the production line with the administration telling me [to] assemble this student's education." Cleo took the school district administration's lack of respect personally. She described how offended she was that strike substitute teachers received higher pay rates. Several other trainees complained about substitute pay rates.

Cleo wanted more school decision making authority because she felt that this built teachers' investment in those schools. Ownership or investment in the institution (school) was part of being a professional teacher. Teachers should "have a say in what my school's goals and purposes are, with control over the programs offered." Cleo thought that administrators were removed from the realities of teaching. These isolated administrators should be required to teach, and they should not enjoy such a large salary differential. Cleo and Cain shared a resentment toward administrators whom she felt gave individual teachers "a slap in the face . . . I feel like they don't care about me."

We see that trainees who supported the strike and the work-to-rule already claimed membership in the UTLA teacher community. They felt they had completed the role of LAUSD trainee program member. Trainees who supported the union's demand for site-based management criticized the administrative community because those administrators were not part of the teacher or classroom communities. Trainees resented the administration community's authority over teachers and the individual administrator's discounting of the teacher's professional value. However, though the trainees distanced themselves from the administrative community, they still wanted the high pay they thought administrators received.

Curiously, trainees felt administrators' high salaries gave administrators professional status having just given many examples that teachers failed to respect highly paid administrators. I say curiously because trainees supported the union demand for improved salaries because these salary gains translated in the trainee's opinion to higher status for teachers. Here we have a good example showing how people can hold contradictory opinions and not worry about that contradiction. This pair of contradictory ideas symbolizes a much wider contradiction about professionals. Professional communities claim the importance in an ethic of service over financial reward to outsiders. Internally those professional communities recognize financial reward as important in many aspects of that community's life. For instance we could ask a lawyer if the local bar association has considered enforcing standard fees for services. It does not require a huge inferential leap to guess the substance of the reply.

The Neutral Position:
Caroline, Carmen, Chase, and Cecil

Cecil provided no data about his position on the strike. He claimed that teachers deserved more money. Caroline was brief in her remarks. She complied with the strike call and she did not turn in her grades but also stated, "I don't really agree with how the union is going about things."

In contrast, Carmen turned in her grades but she claimed to support the union's demand for site-based management and higher salaries. She felt a strong obligation to fulfill her teaching duties in order to receive her credential. However, she also went on strike for three days to show sympathy with the striking teachers. Carmen, like the active union supporters, claimed she was an LAUSD teacher. For Carmen the union representatives said the things that the Los Angeles teachers felt. The union represented "us as a group of teachers." However, Carmen judged "going through these little gyrations" by not handing in grades was something teachers should not have to go through. She thought withholding grades was unprofessional. An experience at her school reinforced this opinion.

Carmen told how a sympathetic mentor teacher offered help with Carmen's grade keeping. This mentor approached Carmen and told her that she could get a substitute teacher to cover classes as Carmen completed her grades. As Carmen's mentor this teacher had some unused substitute teacher money. The mentor asked the secretary to arrange for a substitute using the outstanding allowance. Apparently, the school secretary "forgot" to get the substitute and so Carmen had to teach the regular classes. According to Carmen she was given a day to complete the final grades before the strike by school administrators. Carmen suspected she was put on the union list of teachers who didn't support the grade boycott by the "nosy" and allegedly "forgetful" secretary. Other trainees reported grade books from teachers in their schools were "misplaced." Chad and Carmen went further and they claimed that counselors, who compiled teachers' grades, cooperated with the union to produce the "blacklist."

© 1995 by the National Center for Research on Teacher Learning

Like other teachers, Carmen identified a lack of respect by the school administration and by society that was indicated by teachers' low pay. Carmen, and the ex-engineer Carson, drew a contrast between the way relationships worked in their former occupations and the authoritarian way they get defined in a school.

> I hate having to jump every time the bell rings. You're treated very much as a child or a peon. I think it is the way the system is set up. I feel like a factory worker having to punch-in every morning. When I was in sales I set my own schedule. I was late 32 times this semester because I live so far away. I was here to start classes but because I was not here the required 15 minutes before classes start the administration put my lateness on my evaluation. You have to sign your initials on a card even when you were only one minute late. I felt like a kid being marked tardy. I tried to transfer to a school closer to home but when the principal phoned here my administrator said I could not transfer because he needed me at the school.

Carmen, although she described herself as a teacher, still felt the obligations to her role as a trainee. She crossed the picket line to fulfill her credential requirement, but she claimed this action distressed her. Carmen felt compelled to explain her decision to the students who challenged her before the strike. She admitted the challenges made her angry.

> I started to give a lesson on a novel or whatever the subject was and the kids shouted out. "We don't want to hear this we want to know what is going to happen next week." Why are we studying if we [the students] are not going to have a test on it? This is the end of the semester.

Carmen said it was embarrassing, but she had as a professional teacher to refute strike supporting teachers who were insensitive to her situation as a trainee. She claimed that teachers sympathetic to the strike had told students that Carmen lied to them when she said that she had to come into school. Carmen said that she felt under considerable stress during the dispute. This stress is the reason that she did not cross the picket lines and instead called the school to say she was sick. Her stress level had been heightened by an incident as she crossed the picket line. Teachers stationed at the picket line had "screamed at her and they shook their fists." This frightened Carmen, and though she felt the teachers were not acting professionally, she also blamed the district and the administration for reducing teachers to these unprofessional acts. "It is the only method open to the strikers for showing the community outside school what is going on."

Chase, another trainee who remained neutral in the strike, handed in his grades. Chase wanted to see teachers "having the power to give credentials and to evaluate ourselves." He wanted teachers to have some say in the way resources get allocated in his school. However, he gave a negative example of teacher decision making. He belonged to a group of local English teachers who used a coordinating committee as an occasion to judge colleagues' teaching. The discussion resulted in "teachers refusing to allow a choice between the alternative books, and instead, those teachers imposed one unpopular choice on everyone." Teachers at the meeting became competitive. "If you're not going to allow us to do *Romeo and Juliet* then we won't let you study *To Kill a Mockingbird*." Beyond this one committee experience Chase wonders why he has to stay up till two in the morning developing tests and teaching materials for books he knows that other teachers have taught. Chase is concerned about the union's demand for site-based management. His experience has taught him that teachers fail to cooperate and they are secretive about how they teach.

Despite being skeptical about teacher control, he does support the frequent trainees' claim that teachers have a better sense of what students need without "having them [administrators] dictate from some office." Chase also believed that administrator pay was inflated compared to teachers' salaries. Further, he questioned the anomaly that teachers are unpaid for handing in grades, but the administration threatened to cut the teachers' salaries if they failed to hand in the grades. To Chase, the pending court decision initiated by the district showed the dictatorial stance by administrators. They could demand teachers complete a duty that was not part of the teachers' contract.

Carmen saw two roles, LAUSD teacher and LAUSD trainee, both of which had responsibilities that she should fulfill. We do not have to infer whether personal circumstance, weakness of will, or some principled reasoning influenced Carmen's decision to remain neutral during the dispute. Those inferences about causation are difficult.

She told us that because she was a trainee she felt committed to remain neutral. Carmen assumed the role, responsibilities, and actions of an LAUSD teacher, but she felt constrained based on her prior commitments to the trainee program. In contrast, Chase harbored doubts about the LAUSD teacher community's ability to act in the students' best interests. Chase, unlike Carmen, did not describe himself as straddled between the trainee's role and the teacher's role. He talked as an LAUSD teacher community member but questioned that community's ability to act in collegial fashion in decision making areas that Chase valued.

Based on data Carmen and Chase provide we can see that a neutral stance is not an "undecided" stance. Several reasonable alternatives exist to justify the neutral position. This position does not automatically imply weak or poor decision making by the person holding it.

Active Union Opposition:
Camille, Catherine, Carol, and Chad

Catherine took no part in either the boycott or the strike. She did this because she felt that the district's offer was a good one. She described the building union representative as hostile to her decision and avoided any further communication with him. "I don't care what my union rep has to say or what he thinks." She discounted what the union said on a personal level, and she rejected the UTLA community that the union official represented.

How do we know this was not a simple clash between two individuals? This trainee, Catherine, was the only one out of four trainees at her school who took no part in the grade boycott. Therefore, she felt pressured to justify her position because many people at her school were hostile to her views. One way that hostility manifested itself was that she received notes or she heard comments that suggested she not take any pay raise the union secured. The UTLA community at her school rejected Catherine as a member of that community. She justified taking any pay increase because "I pay my union dues." Catherine did not think she was a freeloader.

How could Catherine reject other teachers and be rejected by other teachers at her school and yet describe herself as a happy professional in that hostile context? Catherine's classroom and teaching mathematics were very important to her. During Catherine's first trainee year she had no classroom assigned exclusively to her. She told the NCRTE interviewer how happy she was that she had a classroom. Now that she did not share a classroom with other teachers, she purchased posters depicting the history of mathematics and hoped to attend a university course on the subject. Also Catherine was unusual among the math trainees because she liked teaching "basic and college preparatory" classes. She observed Jaime Escalante and attended the local professional association meetings for mathematics teachers. Catherine was a trainee who became absorbed by the classroom community. The colleagues she felt most affinity toward were other mathematics teachers in other schools. She thought that at least the students recognized by her actions that there were teachers who were "not going to all of a sudden walk out on them."

Chad described himself as isolated from other teachers in his school. Chad, like Catherine, took no part in the strike or the grade boycott. He was blacklisted by the union along with other teachers in the school. This blacklisting prompted Chad to tell the NCRTE interviewer: "Now I know the 26 teachers I can drink coffee with." Furthermore, he received verbal abuse from strikers and he received an unsigned note telling him he should refuse any pay raise. "I was told [by the union representative] the Thursday before the strike began that I would be frozen out socially. Teachers who were friendly now would not be as friendly when they returned." Chad arrived at school by 4:30 a.m. to avoid a confrontation with demonstrators at the picket line.

Chad described the teachers' actions, withholding grades for extra money, as "terrible." He told the students in his classes that he would not strike and he described the students as "pawns" in a leverage move by the union.

> I cannot imagine any of my teachers ever striking or doing anything else like this. To turn on the television set and see thousands of teachers dancing in Exposition Park to "I Can't Get No Satisfaction" is so strange to me. I think there is a certain standard of behavior, a certain ethic, that comes with being a teacher.

© 1995 by the National Center for Research on Teacher Learning

He distanced himself from a new mentor assigned to him who strongly supported the union. This mentor sent him notes on union headed paper, a practice which made Chad uneasy. He had several arguments with the new mentor whom he felt had "betrayed me." Chad cannot understand why the Trainee Program paired him with this mentor. "I think it is absolutely crazy to have me matched with a pro-union, striking teacher. What am I going to learn from them? I'm teaching and they are not."

Chad's isolation from colleagues was not caused only by his stance in the labor dispute. He transferred to the school that academic year and he found that the staff segregated along racial lines in the lunch room. This informal arrangement, sanctioned by both the African-American and white staff members, resulted in Chad's decision to remain in the classroom and be available to students. His students brought Chad's lunch from the cafeteria. Furthermore, Chad had a physical problem which meant he had to use crutches. This limitation also restricted his opportunities to socialize with other teachers.

Chad and Catherine found the boycott action and the strike unprofessional. They judged the union's actions as directed ultimately against students—the wrong group to hurt. Camille and Carol cited personal circumstances for taking no part in the dispute. Camille was pregnant, and she claimed the union building representative supported her decision not to strike. Also, she felt that as a trainee she could not freely support the teachers' actions. Camille, like other trainees who withheld support from the union's actions, described herself as still part of the Trainee Program.

Carol had accepted a place in graduate school. The teacher education graduate program required a full teaching credential. She worried that her teaching credential would be jeopardized through her support of the union. Carol felt sympathetic toward teachers in the dispute, but her sympathy was limited because she would not join the UTLA teacher community. She filled out the official and union sponsored grade cards to avoid being put on the union's blacklist. The grade boycott and the strike actions were concerned with the community to which Los Angeles teachers belonged. In contrast, Carol's decision related to her future. In that future she was not in the LAUSD teacher community or the UTLA community.

Carol claimed she supported, in principle, the union's call for site-based management. However, in practice, she opposed the process that might result from site-based management. What concerned her about site-based management was that a vocal minority of teachers claimed to know what the silent majority of teachers wanted. Carol described how most teachers considered "after a six-hour day teaching" that an hour of marking and an hour of planning represented the way a "conscientious professional" should act. Site-based management meant, in her view, allocating time away from those eight hours teachers had to complete their professional duties. Carol feared that site-based management meetings would be populated by union zealots and that these site-based committees would make decisions not attuned with the absent silent majority.

Chad and Catherine showed their commitment lay with their individual classroom communities. Chad described his responsibilities to a community of ideal teachers. Ideal teachers shaped in part by remembrances of teachers past. Catherine, on the other hand, claimed she belonged to a tangible community. She saw herself as a member of the mathematics teaching community. Both Chad and Catherine rejected the UTLA teacher community represented by their colleagues. Carol shared a commitment to an identifiable teacher group when she talked about the silent majority of "professional" teachers. When she voiced misgivings about site-based management she pointed out that she admired this silent professional teacher community who quietly performed their duties. Those trainees who actively opposed the UTLA's actions identified very different communities to whom they felt they belonged.

Question 3: How the Dispute Affected the Trainees' Views of Teaching as a Profession

The Active Union Supporters: Cain, Carson, Cleo, and Clark

Cain based on incidents in his school described teachers as not receiving respect as professionals. He thought administrators and counselors in his building denied teachers respect. He repudiated the idea that the dispute affected his view of the profession, but Cain did see the disputed issues as illustrating what experience in schools had taught him. Cain told the story that once at a

mathematics department meeting, counselors and administrators, despite being invited by the teachers, dismissed any teacher input into a problem identified by the mathematics teachers. Apparently the math teachers worried about students who failed Algebra 1 in the first semester going on to do second semester work.

> The word of the teachers counts least and last in anything. We in the math department complained about how the students' programs were wrong. The counselors showed up to explain how they allocated students and the principal turned up after the meeting was half over. The meeting was not run by our head of department or the chief counselor and so it deteriorated. We told them what we thought and the counselors just sat there and they disagreed and then said what they were going to do.

However, despite this negative evaluation of administrators, Cain wanted more administrative oversight of teachers. This mixed view about administration makes sense given that he had applied to be the chair of the mathematics department for the next school year. Cain wanted to join the administrative community and therefore recognized it was incongruous to reject outright the administrative community.

Cleo felt that the administration insulted her when they hired replacements to cover for striking teachers. Unlike Cain she failed to see much value in the administrative community. Cleo perceived that administrative decisions reduced her from a valued professional to a mere employee. She contrasted teaching with other self-regulating professions which required members to take extra schooling and whose professional associations served as gatekeepers. Cleo believed that professionals "set high standards for their practice." Teachers fulfilled similar educational requirements as other professional groups, and yet teachers' technical expertise and their subject-matter knowledge counted less in schools. Teacher professionalism for Cleo was validated by a teacher's unique position to learn about students daily. She felt insulted in a professional sense that the district hired substitutes who shared little of her knowledge and expertise and yet the district paid them more.

Carson saw site-based management as a step toward Los Angeles teachers taking more responsibility and becoming more professionally accountable. He recalled how as an engineer he was held professionally accountable through his involvement in building projects. Carson saw the team as taking responsibility to complete projects and exerting collegial pressure on individuals to complete their part. Site-based management in schools, Carson felt, would produce similar accountability among the school professionals. Teacher involvement in decision making, based on Carson's engineering experience, leads to productive collegial exchange. He contrasts the engineering experience with the reality in his school where he saw isolated teachers who are removed from decision making. In education, teachers are not held accountable as part of an educational team.

Clark, in a baseline interview, expressed the opinion that professionals should be paid for their time in training courses. Two years later he still felt that "the system" was unresponsive to teachers. Clark worried that the dispute, especially the strike action, may further divide adults in his building and that the strike could alienate students. Just before the strike he had produced a play that seemed to draw people together. The dispute could dissipate the goodwill his play had helped induce. However, Clark saw the strike as significant for teachers as a professional group. The strike signaled a change in the teaching force from a compliant female-dominated group to a group where rebellious male teachers fight for greater recognition and authority for all teachers. We might not agree with this biased assessment of the causes for the change, but Clark has noticed a change in labor relations within schools.

The Neutral Position: Caroline, Carmen, Chase, and Cecil

Caroline observed that the dispute reinforced her opinion that teachers at her school respected the individual decisions each teacher made. This situation stood in direct contrast to the incidents that other trainees, like Catherine and Chad, described at the trainee program meetings. They thought that fellow trainees were intolerant or they were hostile to trainees like themselves who decided to remain neutral in the dispute. Caroline was in a building where there was a culture of tolerance among teachers. She directed toward the union any blame for diminishing teachers'

© 1995 by the National Center for Research on Teacher Learning

professionalism. Professional teachers respect the views of others and that was why Caroline was upset by some union members' lack of tolerance. However, the dispute did not affect her views about teaching as a profession. "I don't think my views about teaching have changed [from when she was interviewed two years before]; it is an indispensable profession."

Carmen sympathized with the union's aims, and she saw that the teachers were driven to extremes because people lacked respect for teachers as professionals. No respect for teachers originated from the Los Angeles administration and school board. Furthermore, this lack of professional regard affected, she thought, the students' judgments about teachers and it extended into the community where teachers received little professional respect. Carmen believed that, ideally, professional teachers should receive automatic raises every year and that teachers should not be reduced to acrimonious contract disputes. Teachers should not be reduced as professionals to "go through these childish things" whenever the contract was up for renewal.

Chase did not think that those who ran the schools respected him as a professional. The dispute confirmed his suspicions that school administrators failed to value him as a professional. The evaluation process just before the strike symbolized a lack of regard for teachers.

> You're not evaluated by teachers but an administrator who has 50 other teachers to see. My administrator liked me so I got a good evaluation, but she doesn't like another teacher and they get bad evaluations. We need to credential ourselves, evaluate ourselves, and design our curriculum. Everything is private and guarded among teachers. I don't like labor problems, but I don't like hearing the school board president saying we have to work only for ten months and so teachers deserve less money. The school board president said that she would like an 11 percent raise every year like the teachers wanted. I think she was in real estate or something. She has never taught in a class. When you hear this stuff it gets discouraging professionally speaking.

Active Union Opposition: Camille, Catherine, Carol, and Chad

The striking teachers' actions during the dispute made Carol conclude that many colleagues should not be teaching. The dispute had prompted her to think that professional standards for teachers could and should be raised in two ways. First, she wanted to see higher entry standards imposed on teachers entering the profession. Carol described the current C-Best (California) entry test as a "joke of a test," which any "eighth grade student could pass. To me, it seems ludicrously easy." Second, she advocated closing alternative routes of entry to teaching by abolishing the Teacher Trainee Program and the Emergency Credential Program. For Carol, these programs represented an "easy route" into teaching. "I love the Teacher Trainee Program but it's too easy for people to become teachers." Carol wanted the teaching profession to adopt a law school model with teachers taking the equivalent of the bar exams. She wanted "hurdles" so that teachers had to "prove ourselves professionally."

Chad, like Carol, concluded that some colleagues should not be teaching. Chad thought it was important for teachers to provide professional role models for students. He saw the teachers who actively supported the dispute as poor role models. The union created alternative grade cards for students but the union directed teachers not to enter grades on official records. Chad vigorously opposed the union's idea that withholding student grades was a professional strategy to further the union's aims. Student grades, Chad thought, represented important validation for students, and teachers who withheld grades were acting professionally irresponsible.

> Teachers [not striking] had nails driven into their tires and other teachers' tires were flattened. The [striking] teachers stood in front of my classroom windows Friday and they yelled. A teacher jumped in front of my car to result in a confrontation and the strikers put my name on a placard. It is crazy that teachers should act like that. Teachers have to be role models and the behavior so many of our teachers exhibited especially in front of students doesn't set a very good model.

Catherine felt that she expressed her professionalism by fulfilling her obligation to students. She reassured the students that she would not "walk away" from them. This trainee

thought it important that students knew she would be at school. Teachers who walked away and who supported the strike failed in their professional duty. Catherine claimed that her professional duty was to be at school teaching mathematics, and providing that service was an important part of being a teaching professional.

What Did the Trainees Learn from Labor Relations 101?

As I read through the baseline interviews for these trainees I was impressed by the enthusiasm many described for their new career. Several trainees described how they felt privileged to be in partnership with an urban district—a district they felt valued their contributions as new teachers. Less than two years later we may wonder what happened to those motivated novices. The three interviews, which trainees completed over a two year period, document changes in various areas. However, in very few areas were those changes more marked than in how they saw the teaching profession and its status relative to administrators, the district, and the community. The labor dispute precipitated some changes, but the change over time among the novices encompassed more than the just the strike.

The labor dispute was a dramatic event in the Los Angeles District. This is not a district with a record of prolonged strikes and contract disputes. The labor dispute was an unusual event, and it had polarizing effects on the trainees. During the dispute, the trainees focused both on their allegiances and their sense of professional responsibility.

One thing these trainees learned from the dispute was to distrust people associated with the Teacher Trainee Program. Trainees reported they could not talk to people associated with the program. This represents a problem for any school district that sets up a training program using faculty who have other roles and responsibilities in the district. It is difficult for a trainee to establish during a labor dispute how a program instructor is responding to them in an ongoing labor dispute. There are always questions from the trainee's point of view about whether training program personnel can be trusted in the way an independent university supervisor could. Furthermore, trainees are confused when mentors and instructors in the program adopt varying stances to the dispute. Some Los Angeles mentors openly supported the strike and pressured trainees to think like they did and conform with some of the strikers' activities. This obviously had negative effects on certain trainees.

The Teacher Trainee program claimed it was neutral in the dispute and that the trainees could "freely choose" to support the union action. This was a poor decision by the training program. Clearly, these trainees were not free to choose. The program required trainees to fulfill two requirements. First, the trainees had to complete the required number of days teaching. Some trainees felt they were close to being denied a full teaching credential if the strike went on for a long time. In other words, some trainees were not free to choose because they could not gamble that the strike would be short. We might not be sympathetic with a frequently absent trainee, but someone who was ill for a long time also would be denied a credential.

Second, the trainees were under pressure to get a favorable evaluation from their school administrator. The story about the trainee who was a "valued teacher" showed how important the evaluation was for full certification. The administrator might have been motivated by the best principles of clinical supervision when offering suggestions for improvement, but the district office officials saw those negative remarks in a very different light. Overall, on the question of trainees' freedom to choose, we may be forgiven for thinking that the trainees were like Henry Ford's customers free to choose any color Model T as long as it was black! The undesirable effect of declared program neutrality was that trainees learned to give the appearance of favoring both sides, lie, keep silent, and consequently, not feel very good about the program from which they were about to graduate.

Let us turn our attention to the union. The union served the trainees just as poorly during the dispute. For half the trainees the union represented a "good." These trainees either actively supported the union position or they were individually neutral but sympathetic with the union's position. We can be glad that these trainees did not have to test their faith in the union's ability and its willingness to defend them if they had been

© 1995 by the National Center for Research on Teacher Learning

denied a teaching credential. Since trainees never had to test union protection, some trainees learned positive lessons about union membership and action. However, what they learned may have been substantially different had any trainee needed union representation when threatened with dismissal.

For the other trainees the union represented an "evil." Trainees who had commitments to communities, not the UTLA teachers' community, had unpleasant things happen to them. Those trainees claimed these unpleasant experiences affected how they would see and judge future colleagues. However, no trainee except Chad steadfastly opposed the union. Most trainees limited their criticism to specific acts by the union. We could argue that the union felt they had to pressure all "teachers" (including trainees) in the school to exert group discipline and further union claims for teacher solidarity. This argument is at odds with the evidence where the unions representatives in different schools gave trainees contradictory advice. For the trainees, chance and geography determined whatever union advice they received. Trainees did not seem to be the only ones who are confused about whether a teacher trainee is or is not a full union member with all the responsibilities, obligations, and protection which membership promises.

Last, I would argue that Labor Relations 101 reinforced changing beliefs about the teaching profession, in general, and the trainees' personal contribution in particular. Trainees noticed how easily the district literally "bought" substitutes to cover the striking teachers. Trainees from all sides of the dispute described how the district and its representatives had little respect for them as serious professionals. Several trainees illustrated how school and district administrators discounted their expertise. This treatment by administrators led trainees to charge that school administrators lacked the knowledge a teacher gains through constant daily contact with students. The final irony trainees perceived was that the action taken by the teachers ultimately benefited the administrators. The sacrifice by teachers to secure a large pay increase would increase, not decrease, the salary difference between teachers and administrators. The administrators would use the new teacher raises as a bargaining lever in their own contract negotiations.

The legislative intent in the Alternate Route Training Bill was to attract people with valuable work experiences into the classroom. The legislators hoped to attract people who had not chosen teaching while at college. At least half the trainees described in this study and a significant number of other trainees in the Teacher Training Program came from other careers. No trainee, however, described how the schools or the district utilized or capitalized on that past work experience. Instead we hear stories that suggest trainees had the same status as raw recruits from a college of education. Is it too extreme to characterize the trainees as "cannon fodder" or "shock troops" thrown into the front lines of urban education? Is this the basis for the remarks by trainees that they felt they were simply numbers to the district? Twelve trainees is too small number from which to generalize, but, several within the group talked about leaving the LAUSD after they were fully credentialed. It is possible that many trainees did leave teaching after completing the two year program, though unfortunately researchers in this study were unable to track whether in fact they did.

What do We Learn from Labor Relations 101?

The small sample makes it impossible to generalize the trainees' experiences. Instead, I raise key questions central to any new teacher education program which requires prospective teachers' long term presence in schools before becoming fully certified.

What is a Trainee's Status in the School?

We all know the answer to the status question if we are talking about a student from a university completing student practice. These students are more like visitors to the school and they may never see the school again. As a visitor or guest to the community, the student teacher assumes certain responsibilities, but the school community members are unlikely to press the rights and responsibilities that accompany full-time membership in that community.

Trainees or inductees who enter the school community for longer periods with the prospect of full-time employment as the final outcome do not qualify as "visitors." Trainees may build a career in that school, and the school community is likely to demand that the trainees assume full responsibility as a member of the school community. Our Los Angeles story showed that one cannot assume, as did the Los Angeles Teacher Trainee program, that trainees are free to exercise choice. The program treated its trainees as though they were autonomous individuals and no different from any other teacher in the school. The trainees stand as eloquent testimony that they were in fact faced with quite uncomfortable and perhaps avoidable role conflicts and pressures.

I offer the following example to suggest that it is possible to define trainee status in teacher education programs in more helpful ways, although this is an example and not a model to adopt. In Britain, at least during the 1970s, student teachers could become *student* members of a teacher union. Student teacher union members paid minimal union dues and they enjoyed some discounts on professional publications and teaching materials. As student members, they also had some access to union advice. The Student Union at the university defended student teachers in disputes about their teaching performance. If, for example, the student teacher was in a school during a labor dispute, the student informed the advisor what action she intended to take. Generally student teachers did not cross union picket lines, and they were not penalized by practice supervisors for not working during a dispute. Student teacher union members had no voting rights, no official union protection, and they were not expected by other teachers to join picket lines.

Obviously, there exist details that do not easily translate into an American context. However, the guiding principle that the trainee not be forced to fulfill duties that antagonize full union members in the school remains sound. Trainees will not be tolerated by the school community as traditional student teachers typically have been. Trainees in unconventional teacher education programs, such as professional development schools or induction programs, have a long time to demonstrate their competence, and probably it is a small inconvenience for a program's instructors to write-off a few days or weeks if a trainee withdraws from school during a strike. Also, the program personnel have a responsibility to explicitly negotiate on the "students'" behalf with building principals when work-to-rule actions could impact a trainee's evaluation by administrators. The damage inflicted on the trainees who remain in the schools seems a greater price to pay than program personnel being more flexible in the demands they make on trainees. The Los Angeles story teaches us that many problems encountered by the trainees arose because the program insisted the students fulfill those two requirements despite changed circumstances.

What Should Unions Demand from Trainees?

Based on these trainees' experiences, and Bridges' (1986) research evidence, this question is simple to answer. Teacher unions might offer to trainees, emergency credentialed staff, and substitute teachers in schools the limited protection that they can deliver to those groups. Every organization has to generate income but this Los Angeles example suggests the union might defer the financial benefit and earn more goodwill if it charged trainees less money. In the Los Angeles story some responsible union representatives advised the trainees well and urged them to fulfill the requirements of the program. We can hope those individuals influenced other teachers not to apply unwarranted pressure on the neutral trainees to join the union action. Those other union representatives and teachers who allowed themselves to get caught up in the emotions of the moment did significant damage to the union. I suspect the union lost goodwill among trainees who could have eventually become productive and active members.

Should Teacher Professionalism be Taught or be Caught?

The Los Angeles trainee story tells us that some individuals define their professionalism personally rather than collectively and within the classroom's confines. We have trainees who described an overriding responsibility to their students. There were trainees who described their professionalism as bounded by or consistent with personal interests. Finally, we had trainees who described their sense of teacher professionalism extending beyond the boundaries of the

© 1995 by the National Center for Research on Teacher Learning

classroom to groups like the UTLA, the local English teachers curriculum committee, or the district's secondary mathematics teachers. These stories represent on a very small scale the elements found in the professional ethics literature.

Trainees offered versions of professionalism that varied according to the community that individual recognized as important. Individuals make claims that their particular community is morally deserving. Trainees' remarks that suggested that the administrators had little or no professional worth served as confirmation that the teachers (and trainees) as a group were more professional than others. Independent of the individual's particular stance toward the union action, trainees who thought themselves LAUSD teachers or trainees judged that the administrative community carried less moral weight than their professed group. This divisive way to see different professional groups in the school does not build confidence for proposals for cooperation, site-based management, and school improvement.

The Los Angeles story gives us an example of prospective teachers stumbling along to make sense of what it means to be a professional. The program and the schools ignored any prior experience these trainees might bring and the district processed them through training in a way that resembled a traditional teacher education program. The dispute highlighted that the Los Angeles Teacher Training Program was a teacher education program that discounted the participant's experience. The trainees give us another reminder of how important it is to build on learner experience in professional education. This seems especially important in a professional development program that sought out people who had been members of other professions because these individuals presumably brought something valuable with them to teaching.

What these individuals brought with them was experience and the ability to define for themselves what it meant to be a professional. This leads us to consider how we could teach people to be professionals and yet allow individual autonomy. Los Angeles shows us there is something troubling about the "free choice" policy pursued by the Teacher Trainee program. Educators, as many in society, are reluctant to involve themselves in moral discussions because they fear that the discussion involves saying versions of the "good" have different value. Teacher education programs are reluctant to give the appearance of interfering with the students' autonomy. A teacher educator who told prospective students that a "professional teacher" is one who joins and who actively supports the union could rightly be accused of bias. However, bias might be preferable to the default behavior of a teacher educator who tacitly subscribes to "floating relativism" where prospective teachers in their class get no advice. Silence in moral argumentation leads the participants to assume that a private version of teacher professionalism must be right. Several trainees did considerable damage to themselves when they acted on their "private version" of teacher professionalism.

In different aspects of our lives we are deciding that sustained individual success relies on maintaining both parts of the individual-collective equation. Team formation in industry, cooperative learning for teachers and students in schools, and professional development schools (with induction or alternate teacher preparation routes) tell us that maintaining and building relationships is important. We have less confidence that isolated individuals can define for themselves what it means to be professionals. The Los Angeles trainees show us that to be a professional you define it by rights and responsibilities to a particular community. In individual cases we might like to take issue with the communities that claimed a trainee's allegiance. However, this commits us to actively engaging prospective teachers in public conversations about their sense of being professional.

If we put prospective teachers, like these trainees, in situations that require community building and relationship maintenance skills we have a responsibility to teach them. It is probably impossible and undesirable to dictate how these individuals define themselves as individuals and members of a school community. However, this does not exclude teaching people the political skills required to become effective professionals. Through daily examples that arise in a professional school's living laboratory teacher educators could teach tolerance, consensus building, constructive but critical dialogue, and the arts involved in persuasive presentation. Effective professionals do not operate in vacuums. Effective professionals operate well in group situations and must have the ability to communicate with other professionals if they are to earn the respect and the admiration of others within the community.

These political or community living skills require explicit teaching. It seems incongruous that we can argue that skills and a sense of being a professional essential to collective life should be left to the individual to "catch" in splendid isolation. Community living skills take on special importance if schools truly adopt ideas such as site-based management and teacher leadership.

Notes

[1] Throughout this paper trainees are people assigned to a particular school for a long time. Los Angeles trainees were assigned to schools they would teach in after completing their two-year teacher education program. This is to distinguish them from student teachers who visit a school for 10 to 15 weeks and possibly never return.

[2] These data do not represent my explanation of mental events that the trainees went through before making their decision. I endorse Gilbert Ryle's criticism of Aristotle's practical reasoning. There is no ghostly stage where people supposedly play out what they are going to decide before they act. Instead, I suggest that this is the form of public reasoning the NCRTE interviewers got the trainees to engage in after the fact. See Ryle, G. (1949). The Concept of Mind p.67. Chicago: University Press.

References

Bacharach, S. B. & Shedd, J. R. (1989). Power and empowerment: The constraining myths and emerging structures of teacher unionism in an age of reform. In J. Hannaway & R. L. Crowson (Eds.). *The politics of reforming school administration* (pp. 139-160). New York: Falmer Press.

Blase, J. J. (1989). The teacher's political orientation vis-a-vis the principal: The micropolitics of school. In J. Hannaway & R. L. Crowson (Eds.). *The politics of reforming school administration* (pp.113-126). New York: Falmer Press.

Bridges, E. M. (1986). *The incompetent teacher*. Philadelphia: Falmer Press.

Johnson, S. M. (1984). *Teacher unions in schools*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Lortie, D. (1975). *Schoolteacher: A sociological study*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

MacIntyre, A. (1988). *Whose Justice? Which Rationality?* Notre Dame Press: Indiana.

McLaughlin, M. W. & Pfeifer, R. S. (1988). *Teacher evaluation: Improvement, accountability, and effective learning*. New York: Teachers College Press.

© 1995 by the National Center for Research on Teacher Learning